

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain pending in the application. New claims 10-13 have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 1 and 6 and the subject matter of new claims 10-13 are supported by the original disclosure. The amendments to claims 1 and 6 and the subject matter of new claim 13 find support in the original disclosure at, for example, page 3, lines 13-15, and page 4, line 15 to page 5, line 2. New claims 10-12 are supported in the original disclosure at, for example, page 5, lines 20-27. Accordingly, approval and entry of the claim amendments and new claims are respectfully submitted.

The specification has been amended to address the specific objections set forth in the Office Action. More specifically, as amended the specification includes headings and sub-headings consistent with those set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.77(b). A summary of the invention has also been added. The summary is supported by claims 1, 6, 7, and 9, which constitute part of the original disclosure. Accordingly, all amendments to the specification are fully supported by the original disclosure, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,970,474 to LeRoy et al. (hereinafter "LeRoy"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As clarified by the above claim amendments, claims 1 and 6 relate to information distribution methods for distribution of medical information to registered users. As such, the methods are envisioned for use, for example, in the health care field. In contrast, LeRoy relates to a registry (e.g., bridal registry) information system designed to avoid duplicate purchases of registered gifts by different customers. The intended applications -- i.e.,

medical information distribution versus bridal registries -- of the methods of the LeRoy and the present invention as defined in claims 1 and 6 are completely unrelated to one another. For this reason alone, the Section 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Additionally, amended claims 1 and 6 recite that the requesting collection kiosks receive update user information from the computer system and stores the update user information for subsequent requests. Because the requesting collection kiosk is able to store the update user information, there is no need for constant back-and-forth communications between the collection kiosk and the computer system every time the collection kiosk is accessed. In contrast, LeRoy is specifically designed to send a new request from the gift registry kiosk to the host database every time a customer activates the gift registry kiosk. This design is intended to accomplish the objects of providing the customer with "real-time" updated information from the host database and of ensuring that customers retrieve "a current list to avoid making duplicate purchases." Column 4, lines 5-14. As a consequence, the gift registry kiosks of LeRoy are seemingly designed without memories for storage of the user information from the host database. Such memories are unnecessary, because every time the gift registry kiosk is accessed, it will communicate with the host database to get an up-to-date listing of the gift registry.

For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 6 should be withdrawn. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 5, being dependent from claim 1 and including all of the distinguishing features thereof, are patentable for the above-advanced reasons.

Claims 7-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by the disclosure of U.S. Patent No. 6,403,897 to Bluth et al. (hereinafter "Bluth"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons given below and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

The cited document is not available as prior art under 102(e) because the presently claimed invention as set forth in claims 1 and 6 was conceived and reduced to practice prior to the April 14, 2000 filing date of Bluth.

With regard to claim 1, the Hensley Declaration and its supporting exhibits demonstrate that prior to April 14, 2000, the inventors had in their possession all of the features and limitations of claim 1 (See Hensley Declaration ¶¶ 5-12) and claim 6 (Hensley Declaration ¶¶ 5-11 and 17).

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 4 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeRoy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,267 to McMillan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As explained above, LeRoy is deficient vis-à-vis claim 1 because LeRoy fails to disclose or reasonably suggest, among other things, a distribution system for medical information or the storage of user information at the collection kiosk. McMillan, which has been cited for its alleged disclosure of the use of File Transfer Protocol (FTP), does not overcome all of the deficiencies of LeRoy vis-à-vis claim 1, from which claim 2 depends.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 2.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeRoy in view of Bluth. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, as explained above, LeRoy is deficient vis-à-vis claim 1, from which claim 4 depends, because LeRoy fails to disclose or reasonably suggest, among other things, a distribution system for medical information or the storage of user information at the collection kiosk. Bluth does not overcome all of these deficiencies. For this reason alone the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

Second, Bluth does not constitute prior art against claim 1, from which claim 4 depends. For this additional reason, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

Third, as explained above LeRoy is designed to send a new request from the gift registry kiosk to the host database every time a customer activates the gift registry kiosk. This design apparently accomplishes the objects of providing the customer with "real-time" updated information from the host database and of ensuring that customers retrieve "a current list to avoid making duplicate purchases." Column 4, lines 5-14. Modifying LeRoy to send a request for the generated update user information once a day or another periodic interval would not further these objects.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 4.

Response
In re: Hays
Serial No. 09/782,685
Filed: February 13, 2001
Page 13 of 13

Finally, new claims 10-13 depend from independent claims 1, 6 or 7. Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are allowable for the reasons advanced above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is asked to consider this response and pass the application to allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested.

Applicants have filed a petition for extension of time and a three-month petition fee herewith. In the event that the petition is missing or the three-month petition fee is missing or deficient, the Patent Office is requested to accept this paper as a petition for an extension of time and is authorized to charge any inadequacy to Deposit Account No. 50-0548.

Should the Examiner have any questions, he is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Liniak
Registration No. 33,415

Date: November 22, 2004

LINIAK, BERENATO & WHITE
6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240
Bethesda, MD 20817
Telephone: (301) 896-0600
Facsimile: (301) 896-0607